

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 33-35, 38, 40 and 41 are currently pending.
- Claim 38 is canceled herein.
- Claims 1, 12, 20, 26, and 33 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 12, 20, 26, and 33 can be found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at paragraphs [0126] to [0128]. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

### **Cited Documents**

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Sheasby**: Sheasby et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,539,163
- **Day**: Day et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015

### **Sheasby Fails to Anticipate Claims 12-15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 33-35, 38, 40 and 41**

Claims 12-15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 19, 30, 33-35, 38, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sheasby. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

### Independent Claim 12

Claim 12, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

- ***generating, by a node, one or more events utilized to inform all other nodes of a node tree affected by the one or more events of a dynamic change in the media timeline,*** the change performing at least one of the following:
- changing to a property of the at least one node;
- adding one or more additional nodes as a child to the at least one node;
- removing one or more nodes that are children of the at least one node;
- adding an effect to the at least one node; and
- removing an effect from the at least one node;

Applicant amends independent claim 12 to recite in part “generating, by a node, one or more events utilized to inform all other nodes of a node tree affected by the one or more events of a dynamic change in the media timeline.” This recitation has not been previously presented in the claims and has not been rejected by the Office. Thus at least by virtue of this addition to independent claim 12, the Office’s rejection of claim 12 is overcome. In addition, Applicant understands the Examiner to tentatively agree that Sheasby did not recite the features of claim 12 as amended. Further, Applicant has reviewed the Sheasby reference cannot find mention of the new recitation.

For at least the reasons presented herein, Sheasby does not disclose all of the features of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Sheasby does not anticipate claim 12, and respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 102 rejection of claim 12.

### Dependent Claims 13-15, 17, and 19

Claims 13-15, 17, and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 12. As discussed above, claim 12 is not anticipated by Sheasby, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, claims 13-15, 17, and 19 are also allowable over the cited document of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 20

Claim 20, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

- the media timeline includes a plurality of nodes, wherein the plurality of nodes comprises ***at least one node configured to generate one or more events communicated to*** at least one parent node and a child node, ***the communicating comprising subscribing to receive an indication of an event that affects the parent node or the child node***

Applicant amends independent claim 20 to recite in part “***at least one node configured to generate one or more events communicated to*** at least one parent node and a child node, ***the communicating comprising subscribing to receive an indication of an event that affects the parent node or the child node.***” This recitation has not been previously presented in the claims and has not been rejected by the Office. Thus at least by virtue of this addition to independent claim 20, the Office’s rejection of claim 20 is overcome. In addition, Applicant understands the Examiner to tentatively agree that Sheasby did not recite the features of claim 20 as amended. Further, Applicant has reviewed the Sheasby reference cannot find mention of the new recitation.

For at least the reasons presented herein, Sheasby does not disclose all of the features of claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Sheasby does not anticipate claim 20, and respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 102 rejection of claim 20.

### Dependent Claims 23 and 24

Claims 23 and 24 ultimately depend from independent claim 20. As discussed above, claim 20 is not anticipated by Sheasby, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are also allowable over the cited document of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 26

Claim 26, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

- at least one node is configured for communication of events ***generated by the at least one node, the events utilized to inform all other nodes of a node tree affected by the events of*** a change to be made to the structure of the media timeline.

Applicant amends independent claim 26 to recite in part “at least one node is configured for communication of events generated by the at least one node, the events utilized to inform all other nodes of a node tree affected by the events of a change to be made to the structure of the media timeline.” This recitation has not been previously presented in the claims and has not been rejected by the Office. Thus at least by virtue of this addition to independent claim 26, the Office’s rejection of claim 26 is overcome. In addition, Applicant understands the Examiner to tentatively agree that Sheasby did

not recite the features of claim 26 as amended. Further, Applicant has reviewed the Sheasby reference cannot find mention of the new recitation.

For at least the reasons presented herein, Sheasby does not disclose all of the features of claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Sheasby does not anticipate claim 26, and respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 102 rejection of claim 26.

### Dependent Claims 29 and 30

Claims 29 and 30 ultimately depend from independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is not anticipated by Sheasby, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, 29 and 30 are also allowable over the cited document of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.

### Independent Claim 33

Claim 33, as amended herein, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

- ***means for generating, by at least one node of the plurality of nodes, an event that dynamically changes the media timeline, the dynamic change comprising adding a node to the media timeline, removing a node of the media timeline, or changing a node of the media timeline;***
- ***means for communicating the event to one or more nodes affected by the change to the media timeline, the communicating comprising the one or more nodes subscribing to receive the one or more events initiated by another node of the media timeline***

Applicant amends independent claim 33 to recite in part “means for generating, by at least one node of the plurality of nodes, an event that dynamically changes the media timeline, the dynamic change comprising adding a node to the media timeline,

removing a node of the media timeline, or changing a node of the media timeline; means for communicating the event to one or more nodes affected by the change to the media timeline, the communicating comprising the one or more nodes subscribing to receive the one or more events initiated by another node of the media timeline.” This recitation has not been previously presented in the claims and has not been rejected by the Office. Thus at least by virtue of this addition to independent claim 33, the Office’s rejection of claim 33 is overcome. In addition, Applicant understands the Examiner to tentatively agree that Sheasby did not recite the features of claim 33 as amended. Further, Applicant has reviewed the Sheasby reference cannot find mention of the new recitation.

For at least the reasons presented herein, Sheasby does not disclose all of the features of claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Sheasby does not anticipate claim 33, and respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 102 rejection of claim 33.

#### *Dependent Claims 13-15, 17, and 19*

Claims 13-15, 17, and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 12. As discussed above, claim 12 is not anticipated by Sheasby, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, claims 13-15, 17, and 19 are also allowable over the cited document of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.

### **Claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 11 are Non-Obvious Over Sheasby in view of Day**

Claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Sheasby in view of Day. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

#### **Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, in part:

- ***generating, by a node, one or more events that dynamically change the media timeline, the dynamic change comprising adding a node to the media timeline, removing a node of the media timeline, or changing a node of the media timeline;***
- ***communicating the one or more events to one or more nodes affected by the change to the media timeline, the communicating comprising the one or more nodes subscribing to receive the one or more events initiated by another node of the media timeline***

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to recite in part “generating, by a node, one or more events that dynamically change the media timeline, the dynamic change comprising adding a node to the media timeline, removing a node of the media timeline, or changing a node of the media timeline; communicating the one or more events to one or more nodes affected by the change to the media timeline, the communicating comprising the one or more nodes subscribing to receive the one or more events initiated by another node of the media timeline.” This recitation has not been previously presented in the claims and has not been rejected by the Office. Thus at least by virtue of this addition to independent claim 1, the Office’s rejection of claim 1 is overcome. In addition, Applicant understands the Examiner to tentatively agree that the combination of Sheasby and Day did not recite the features of claim 1 as amended. Further,

Applicant has reviewed the Sheasby and Day references cannot find mention of the new recitation.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Sheasby and Day does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 1.

*Dependent Claims 4, 7-9 and 11*

Claims 4, 7-9 and 11 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 4, 7-9 and 11 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim.



## **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Kristina M. Kuhnert/

Dated: September 21, 2010

Kristina M. Kuhnert  
(kristi@leehayes.com; 509-944-4717)  
Registration No. 62665

Colin D. Barnitz  
(colin@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5002)  
Registration No. 35061